

March 12, 1975

the people of the state would want would not have an opportunity to be...a full opportunity to be heard or acted upon by the people's representatives of which 25 make law and that is the way it should stay. I oppose the change.

PRESIDENT: Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. President and members of the Legislature, I also oppose this Rules change. This is not a partisan Legislature. There is no majority, minority organization of the Legislature. There are no secret conference committee meetings which will attempt to bind the body and Senator Cavanaugh has stated the argument, I think, very capably. However, I want to emphasize something. A lot of people don't want lobbyists to send notes into the Legislature because they have trouble dealing with lobbyists. Well, whether the lobbyists should have this power or not, is not the point I am raising now. In fact, some of them do. It is easier to make five people cave in, or four, because in some committees four would constitute a majority than it is to get at 25 on this floor. So the committees should not arrogate to themselves nor should the body give to the committee the power to frustrate, as Senator Cavanaugh said, the will of a majority of the members of the Legislature. Committees are not immaculately conceived in heaven. They are not untouchable. They are not sacred. They are not immune from modification or diminution. I think it would be a mistake to require a vote on a bill of more than 25 votes. The most significant thing we can...that was a dramatic pause. The most significant thing that we can do with a bill is to enact it into law. It takes only 25 votes to do that and I am the one who made that argument to the Committee. So it should not take more votes to do a lesser thing than it takes to do the greatest thing. That is simple logic. I think that this Rule change ought to be defeated and I hope that you will see it the same way.

PRESIDENT: Senator Carsten.

SENATOR CARSTEN: Mr. President and members of the Legislature, I rise in support of the suggested Rule change. Several of us a year ago had sat down and looked at our Rules and suggested many different changes that we thought would be beneficial to this body. We recognize, as a body, that our Committee structure is a big part of it and I think that we, as introducers of bills, should recognize the judgment of that Committee. Each of us sets on two or three committees and we use our best judgment when we vote to advance or indefinitely postpone bills in that committee and I think when we, by 25 votes, disregard the judgment of that committee, we are doing something to our body as a whole. If we are going to go through this process in a very simple matter, we just as well abolish our committee structure. I think it is an important function and I think if a bill is turned down by a committee and the introducer feels that the merits of that bill are strong enough to bring it out without committee consent, he can so influence 30 members on this floor. I am, wholeheartedly, in support of this Rule change and hope that you look favorably toward it. Thank you.